Ham-Digital Digest   Sat, 28 Aug 93   Volume 93 : Issue   22

Today's Topics:
                        99p12-SLIP <-> DOS ka9q?
               Comments please on MFJ 1270B and 1274 TNC's
                                  FAXCAP
                    Passed test, what do I do now?
                          Your packet network?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Aug 93 16:09:49 GMT
From: mustang.mst6.lanl.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!news.claremont.edu!ucivax!
news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!
igor.rutgers.edu!geneva.rutgers.edu!@hub.ucsb.edu
Subject: 99p12-SLIP <-> DOS ka9q?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

michaelw@desaster.hanse.de (Michael Will) writes:

>I could not do a "route add default 192.0.2.44"

The Linux route command has a non-standard syntax. You want

  route add default gw 192.0.2.44

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 1993 19:28:42 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!utah-morgan!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!
col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srgenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Comments please on MFJ 1270B and 1274 TNC's
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Tom J Farish (tjf@beta.lanl.gov) wrote:
: I am about to take the plunge into packet. I've got the radio, the antenna,
: a Mac (also an Amiga). Now I need a TNC. The MFJ units seem to have some
: nice features, and the price is low. How do they work? Compared to BayPac,
: PMP, etc. Is there something I can adapt to my Amiga? How is Savant for
: the Mac? So many questions, so little time...

The 1270 is a more-or-less standard clone of the TAPR TNC-2. It's fine
if all you want is a standard packet TNC.

The 1274 is a multi-mode modem. The hardware is very simple -- a rather
crude PLL type modulator/demodulator with raw serial input/output to
two of the miscellaneous control lines of the serial interface to the
host computer. ALL the decoding is done by a software program (supplied)
in the host PC. This means you MUST use a standard IBM clone.

Note that the 1274 does not use the TXD and RXD bits to send and recieve
the serial data, but uses some handshake lines (I forget which ones)
with the PC doing some kind of parallel poll to do the decoding.
This means if your PC's serial interface is in any way non-standard,
it might not work. Mine didn't. I later found out that one of the
wires on the connector was mis-wired. However, it worked fine with
my Hayes-compatible modem and my Kantronics TNC.

The 1274 has no pre-filtering of the received signal. To get decent
performance on RTTY, CW, FAX, etc. I would recommend some kind of
external filter ahead of the unit. Either selectible IF filters in
your HF transceiver or perhaps a variable-bandwidth audio filter
like the W9GR DSP unit.

AL N1AL

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 1993 16:05:40 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-
feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!msc.edu!raistlin!cdsmail!
mac_arhbld3n2_147.subnet66.cdc.com!user@ames.arpa
Subject: FAXCAP
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <CCACCy.H7y@acsu.buffalo.edu>, v087jsfu@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu
(Danny Anderson) wrote:

> Anybody have a "Faxcap" product? Is this the same as BayPac?

I have one of the Faxcap units. It receives digital signals such as weather
fax, RTTY, CW, etc. When I bought it, some shareware was included to enable
decoding these signals. The one I received was designed for receiving only.
With the right software, I believe you could monitor packet but not
transmit. It isn't equivalent to the BayPac. Hope this helps.

--
Vern Suter   phone: (612) 482-4810
Control Data System, Inc.   email: vern_suter@pigeon.cpg.cdc.com

----

Date: Sat, 28 Aug 1993 01:01:33 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!mvp@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Passed test, what do I do now?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

A few weeks ago, I passed the test for Technician No-Code, and the
examiners sent my application off to FCC Land, where it's currently
in a holding pattern.

So, while waiting for my license, I'm looking at radios and such.

Where's a good place to start to find out about what's going on?
2-meter, naturally, for voice and packet. What about 70cm? 23cm?

Currently I'm thinking along the lines of a dual band 2m/70cm handheld
that receives outside the ham bands, and a TNC for packet.

What about baud rates? 1200 baud sounds horribly slow to me since I
have v.32bis on my computer, but the few people I've talked to say 1200
baud is The Standard for packet. What's the modulation for digital?
It wouldn't happen to be the same as for phone modems, would it? Could
I use my regular modem for a TNC?

What are good handhelds for limited bucks, and which ones should I stay
away from? (I've seen a number of flames at Kenwood.)

Is there a list of acronyms somewhere? (It took me a while to figure
out what an "HT" was.)

(Maybe I'll have my license by Christmas...)

--
Mike Van Pelt | What happens if a big asteroid hits Earth?

```
mvp@netcom.com              | Judging from realistic simulations involving a
                            | sledge hammer and a common laboratory frog, we
                            | can assume it will be pretty bad. -- Dave Barry


------------------------------
```

Date: Thu, 26 Aug 1993 18:33:09 +0000
From: koriel!west.West.Sun.COM!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!seven-up.East.Sun.COM!
sixgun.East.Sun.COM!sungy!uk-usenet.uk.sun.com!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!
dave@ames.arpa
Subject: Your packet network?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <CCD90F.CxH@icsbelf.co.uk> mark@icsbelf.co.uk (Mark Willis) writes:
>
>There is a possibilty thet the packet network in GI will be overhauled in
>the near future. We suffer from enormous congestion problems in 144.650, but
>there is little traffic on the other 2m freqs. (so far)
>
>What I need to know is how is the packet network arranged in your area? The
>main problem seems to be a lack of freqs on 2m, the bandplan being:
>
>   144.625 TCP/IP
>   144.650 BBS and Network access
>   144.675 PacketCluster
>
>The real problem is having nodes AND bbs's on 650. How does the network
>in your area get around this problem? Also, what type of links do you run,
>and at what speed?
>
The network in parts of England (not sure about Scotland, Wales and the
various smaller islands) is vastly improved over a few years ago. I can
connect on dedicated links from Bristol all the way up to Yorkshire, and if
I looked hard enough, I reckon I could get to Scotland if a certain link
reappeared. Apart from one link, which recently got clobbered by a
lightning strike, I think it is 9600baud all the way from Bristol to
Emley Moor, and perhaps beyond. All this is taking place on 70cms and 23cms.

The recommendations for networking are to put links on 430 and 439MHz in
the 70cms band, with the 432 and 433MHz freqs allocated for user access. Other
links can go on 1240/1299MHz, and on higher bands if you can manage it. There
should be no linking on 2M unless you are in a very quiet location. By doing
this, and coordinating user access frequencies, it is possible to end up with
nine user access frequencies (three on 2M, six on 70cm), plus possibly three
or four on 4M, depending on local usage of that band.

The best way of doing links may well be to run full-duplex, so that a given
site can have all its transmitters in one sub-band, and have receivers in

another sub-band (local example: GB7BH will transmit to all its neighbours on 1299MHz and receive from them on different 439MHz frequencies, so eliminating hidden-station effect).

You may need site clearance for non-2M stuff to be legal, but the sooner you apply for it, the quicker it will arrive. In the area around Bristol, there are very few properly integrated nodes which have not got site clearance, and frequencies have been juggled so that those nodes operate on frequencies covered under the normal UK licence (5 nodes out of 19).

For the benefit of non-UK stations, 'site clearance' is a wonderful procedure which has to be used in the UK to get permission to operate unattended stations (which may be at home or at remote sites) on certain bands, most notably 70cms and 23cms, although some recent relaxation in the rules has made parts of 70cms a bit easier to use. The time taken for site clearance varies from two months (best ever recorded) to over two years. This may explain a bit of the background to the UK using mainly 2M for packet operation, because it does not have these problems.

Dave

```
*****************************************************************************
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25     *    Start at the beginning. Go on     *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk  Internet *     until the end. Then stop.         *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org      Amprnet   *      (the king to the white rabbit)  *
*****************************************************************************
```

End of Ham-Digital Digest V93 #22
****